

Remarks/Arguments:

This paper is being submitted in response to the Office Action dated November 21, 2003. Claims 1-25 are presented for examination. Applicants have amended claims 1-5, 9-14, 17-21 and 25. The amendments are not offered for reasons of patentability, but merely to correct typographical errors and to distinctly claim the invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-25 in light of the amendments and remarks made herein.

Applicants' representative hereby authorizes the use of Deposit Account 03-0172 for a Three-month extension of time fee of \$475.00 under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(a)(2), and for any other payment necessary to maintain the application in good standing.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,845,299 ("Arora et al."). The Examiner states:

"Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Arora et al. (5,845,299)."

35 U.S.C. §102(b) states:

"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless ...
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. ..."

According to M.P.E.P. §2131:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicants respectfully submit that Arora et al. fails to disclose all of the elements of each of Applicants' independent claims. Specifically, with respect to Applicants' independent claim 1, Aurora et al. fails to disclose at least the second element claimed by Applicants:

“...receiving via a graphical user interface associate data uniquely describing the associate; ...” (emphasis provided)

Arora et al. does not disclose receiving any data uniquely describing an associate, as described in the present application. At column 2, lines 20-35, and in figs. 3-10, Arora et al. generally discloses using a graphical HTML editor to design a web page. None of these passages, relied on by the Office Action to support the rejection of claims 1-25, nor any other portion of Arora et al., disclose the step of receiving associate data via a graphical user interface where the associate data uniquely describes the associate as described in the present application.


Consequently, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and allow independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 25. Applicants further request the Examiner allow dependent claims 2-8, 9-16 and 18-24 as being allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Conclusion

Entry of this response and allowance of claims 1-25 are respectfully requested. Based on the foregoing remarks Applicant believes that all of the claims in this case are in a condition for allowance and an indication to that effect is earnestly solicited. Furthermore, if the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner should feel free to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

May 21, 2004
Date


Robert R. Lech
Patent Office Reg. No. 37,169
Attorney for Applicants
Direct Dial: (614) 621-7101